

THE Converted Catholic.

EDITED BY FATHER O'CONNOR.

When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.—Luke xxii., 32.

Vol. IV.

MARCH, 1887.

No. 3.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

"I DENY THE RIGHT OF BISHOP, PROPAGANDA, OR POPE TO PUNISH OR CENSURE ME FOR MY OPINIONS OR ACTIONS AS AN AMERICAN CITIZEN."

(Signed) "EDWARD MCGLYNN."

"ROMAN ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY," says Father McGlynn in the closing sentence of his statement and indictment against Archbishop Corrigan, "is the greatest foe of scientific progress, of rational liberty, and a hindrance, rather than a help, in the way of bringing to the whole world the light, the purity and the comfort that come from the teachings and the ministrations of Christ."

We have been preaching this doctrine in New York for the last eight years and have scattered it broadcast through the press, and now that it comes with telling force from Father McGlynn its truth will be accepted by thousands who hitherto called it "prejudice," etc.

FATHER MCGLYNN'S FRIENDS AMONG the parishioners of St. Stephen's Church have hired a hall for their week-day meetings. We shall tender them the

use of Masonic Temple for their Sunday meetings, and if our friends will help us to meet the expenses as heretofore, will give it to them free. They are seeking light and searching for the truth as best they can like all those who came out of Rome during the Reformation; they are fighting for civil and religious freedom, the palladium of American liberty, the watchword of Washington; they are contending for the rights of Americans to govern their country without dictation from the Pope of Rome, and surely in such a movement they deserve the sympathy and support of all.

IN ANSWER TO MANY INQUIRIES WE HAVE to say that we have no sympathy with the "land theory" advocated by Mr. Henry George and Father McGlynn. From what we know of it—and that is not much, as we have not deemed it worthy of serious study—we pronounce it arrant nonsense that will never be adopted by the American people. We heartily coincide with the Rev. Dr. Harper, of Xenia College, Ohio, and other correspondents whose views on this subject will be found elsewhere in this issue.

ONCE AGAIN WE ASK OUR SUBSCRIBERS who are in arrears to pay up. We need money to carry on our work. Help us, good friends, by remitting promptly.

THE ARTISTS OF THE ILLUSTRATED and comic papers have treated the McGlynn case with more accuracy than have the editorial writers. *Puck* had a picture of the Pope as a schoolmaster whipping Father McGlynn who stood on a stool (not the stool of repentance), reading a book labelled "Public School." The picture in *Judge* was the best of all: A politician labelled "Tammany Hall" with his head behind the Pope's back and his hands extended in front, sustains in his brawny arms Pope Leo XIII. who with open mouth is hurling anathema at Father McGlynn—a conspicuous figure in clerical costume with a bold, defiant air. The picture is marked: "*The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau.*"

THE "POETS" OF THE COMIC PAPERS have also been busy with their squibs on the subject. The New York *Tribune* quotes one as follows:

A Catholic priest named McGlynn,
Did not think it a terrible synn

To take a firm stand,
And say "Free is the land;"
But Pope Leo replied. It's too thynn.

But neither the "poet" nor *Tribune* has hit the mark there.

Here is the true inwardness of it:

A Catholic priest, named McGlynn,
Did not think it a terrible synn

To stand by "Public Schools"
'Gainst the Pope's wily tools;
And that made "His Holiness" gryn.

WE CALL THE ATTENTION OF OUR readers to this notice of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC which we re-print from the Boston (Mass.) *Daily Advertiser* of Feb. 2, 1887:

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, edited by Father O'Connor (60 Bible House, New York), the January number of which lies before us, has an interest and significance altogether disproportionate to its size, and scarce suggested by its quiet, unassuming exterior. It is the organ of the dissenters from the Roman Catholic communion, who, however, while leaving the traditions of the ancient church, still have not abandoned that in it which seems good and worthy of imitation. It abounds in bright, racy, epigrammatic polemics on the "evil practices of the church," its assumption of absolute ecclesiastical authority, its tendency to degrade the moral sense by asserting that the head of the church is "the supreme judge on earth and director of the consciences of all men," and the corruption which so widely taints it. The case of Father McGlynn is admirably discussed in the present number; but the leading article, and one of a good deal of power, is "Reasons for Leaving the Church of Rome," by Lord Robert Montagu.

WE HAVE PRINTED LORD ROBERT Montagu's article, "Reasons for Leaving the Church of Rome," to which the *Advertiser* refers, in a neat tract of twenty pages. It is an admirable tract for distribution.

We will send it for a merely nominal price—a few stamps for single copies or 100 copies for one dollar,

The interesting story "full of the Gospel," which the author, Richard J.

Mahony, Esq., an Irish gentleman, has named "Father Martin," and which we printed in these pages last year, has been published in a neat little volume of sixty-four pages which we will forward at 10 cents a copy, or 14 copies for one dollar.

We have also published Father Chiniquy's sermon, "The Crucified Jesus and the Penitent Thief," and the beautiful description of the Virgin Mary entitled "The Portrait of Mary in Heaven, drawn from Holy Scripture," which we hope our friends will help us to distribute. We called the attention of the Tract Society to the beauty and excellence of "The Portrait of Mary in Heaven," and supplied them with a German translation, made by our friend and brother, Rev. J. Geissinger, which they have published in German.

The distribution of these tracts and of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* will be as "bread cast upon the waters, for thou shalt find it after many days."

"Give a portion to seven and also to eight . . .

"In the morning sow the seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand."

I see from the last number of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* that you request those who are unable to pay their subscription for the past year to tell you so. I am one of that little army. But I hope not to remain so always. I will send the subscription in April or May; at present it is impossible for me to do so. We are trying as best we may to live through this long cold winter, but it will soon be over.

[The writer of the above is a convert from Rome living in the far West, to whom we will send the magazine free.]

St. Stephen's Parishioners form a Permanent Organization.

The second public meeting of the parishioners of St. Stephen's Church, who have formed a permanent organization, was held last evening in the large hall they have hired on Twenty-seventh Street and Third Avenue, says the *New York Star* of Feb. 19, and the utmost enthusiasm was evinced in the cause of Father McGlynn. Despite the storm—the rain pouring down in torrents—the hall was filled to its utmost capacity, fully two thousand people being present. Chairman John R. Feeney presided, and in the course of his remarks said: "The cause of Father McGlynn's troubles was that he wanted the youth of New York brought up in the public schools and not have them live in sectarian hatred, as the other side want."

Mr. Gahan, editor of the Roman Catholic paper called the *Catholic Herald*, made an eloquent speech in which he denounced Archbishop Corrigan and Monsignor Preston as the greatest enemies of the people, and concluded by exhorting his hearers to keep their ranks unbroken and stand by Father McGlynn.

A resolution was adopted that no parochial schools would be allowed in the parish, and if built by the money of the wealthy Catholics of the city, as was threatened, they will be boycotted. It was also resolved that the church should be boycotted.

Last week \$2,000 were sent to Father McGlynn by his faithful parishioners, who are resolved that he shall not want though he has been cast out of his Church and home.

REFORMED CATHOLIC WORK.

The Reformed Catholic services in Masonic Temple have been attended by great crowds during the month of February. Roman Catholics have waited, sometimes for an hour, at the close of each service to inquire further "Whether these things be" that Father O'Connor preached every Sunday. Roman Catholic priests and Jesuits "Christian Brothers," ex-priests now in business in this city, learned Catholics, like the "Roman Catholic Layman" who writes for the *Independent*, and the common people have attended in large numbers. Interruptions occurred at every service; at one time, when the hall was filled with one thousand people, six men and one woman stood up in the middle of the sermon and cried out, "We stand up for the Pope against Christ." Such a declaration was so unexpected that a solemn hush followed, and the silence was broken only when the great audience hissed again and again, the hundreds of other Catholics present loudly protesting against such an utterance. Special prayer was offered by Father O'Connor for the Pope's followers that they might become the followers of Christ.

At another time when reference was made by the preacher to the confession of Father Donnelly, who succeeded Father McGlynn in St. Stephen's Church that he could no longer stand the opposition, and, to save his life, must return to his old church—that his place at the head of St. Stephen's rebellious congregation was worse than Purgatory, a disturbance occurred near the door that almost led to a fight. The converted Catholic ushers were knocked about, and invitations to

"come out and settle it" were freely exchanged. One young usher, George Cooney, our printer, said, "though he was a small man he would accept the challenge if he were not a Christian." Mr. J. J. Bru, a young Cuban, also a convert from Rome, who has been Father O'Connor's co-worker from the time the latter commenced to preach in Masonic Temple, by his urbane manners and gentlemanly address helped to quiet the angry Romanists.

At another time, the leader of the band of Catholics who seemed to be a priest, wished to have a number of questions answered about "Peter and the Rock," etc. Father O'Connor invited him to come on the platform the following Sunday evening and ask his questions and they would be publicly answered. This he agreed to do, but when asked for his name and address, "not for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith," as the newspaper editors say, he refused. At the close of the service several members of the congregation, all converts, tackled him and said they would answer his questions if he were a Jesuit a thousand times. The debate was kept up until the lights in the hall were put out.

Many of Father McGlynn's old parishioners attended the services during the month, and to them Father O'Connor gave a special welcome. He had no controversy with them, and as he told them of Christ the only Saviour and pointed out the way to him they listened with attention and respect. The action of Archbishop Corrigan in becoming the tool of Tammany Hall will drive thousands of Catholics out of that Church. God's hand is in it all. The prayers of all Christians are asked for these people.

**"M. A. Corrigan, Abp." and Dr.
Howard Crosby.**

What a self righteous, hypocritical, smug-faced individual M. A. Corrigan, Archbishop of New York, is! In his letter to Father McGlynn of March 15, 1886, he says: "I am forced to say that I would feel humiliated to find a priest of my diocese openly associating with Mr. Beecher, and even Howard Crosby, who only last year insulted us all by saying that the country would rise in its might against Romanists and crush them into dust, because we simply asked that our poor children be permitted, according to the Constitution, to worship God with liberty of conscience."

This whilom saloon-keeper's son feels humiliated to have even one of his priests associated with Dr. Howard Crosby, New York's foremost minister and noblest citizen, in advocating temperance! Of course he does. If temperance were advocated in Newark, N. J., when his father sold whiskey there, the original, genuine "Jersey lightning," the money that gave him his education in Rome would not be forthcoming. He advocate temperance and encourage reform or allow one of his priests to do so! Why, it would be a reflection on his father's business that would cause the paternal bones to rattle in their coffin. Respect for his father's memory, to say nothing of the wealth he inherited from the business, would forbid him. And the priest of his who dared to be a temperance advocate must be crushed! while the Protestant minister who blessed this noble priest for his good works must be stigmatized as unworthy of associating with "any priest of my diocese."

The letter from which we quote was written last March, and it will be observed that "M. A. Corrigan, Abp.," seeks the protection of the Constitution for the vagrant children in the House of Refuge on Randall's Island. Yet the same individual did not respect the Constitution or regard the sacred rights of the citizens of the State, when six months later he tried to defeat the Constitutional Convention, even proposing to his henchmen to get hold of the ballots at the last State election and destroy them.

The Constitutional Convention.

Why Archbishop Corrigan should oppose the Constitutional Convention can be understood when it is known that civil and religious liberty and the appropriation of public money for sectarian purposes will be among the subjects discussed at the forthcoming Convention. Colonel Elliott F. Shepard delivered a lecture before the Brooklyn Republican League, Feb. 16, on the Constitutional Convention, in which he said, "The question of religious liberty would come before the Convention. By the present constitution any one could be disinherited for changing religion. If the rights of one class of people are to be hedged in and cut down by reason of their religion they should have larger liberty. This will undoubtedly bring up the case of interest at the present time of the movement within the Catholic Church to get rid of the Rev. Dr. McGlynn. There are many earnest men who say we have nothing to do with that matter, that it is purely a religious society and that they may dictate things in their own membership just as they please: they

may dictate to others to leave as they please. But may the others leave as they please? Not if they are to put fines and penalties on them and cast them out and proscribe them so that they are not at liberty to stay just where they please on an equality with others. The Romish Church has become a political church. The encyclical of the Pope sent out last year substantially directs all priests to take an active part in the politics of the country.

"We do not object to that, but if a large body of men, seven millions in this country, be directed by a foreign potentate, it is very serious whether it is ecclesiastical tyranny and despotism or whether it is liberty that shall be enjoyed in the State of New York. These questions will come up for discussion undoubtedly. If the people propose to go to sleep they will lose their liberty."

It is a healthy sign of the times when our foremost citizens, gentlemen like Colonel Shepard and Dr. Howard Crosby, set the example of plain speaking on public questions, and use their great influence to counteract the dangers to our institutions from such a political power as the Church of Rome.

In a letter received not long since Colonel Shepard said: "I am very much pleased with the spirit of your magazine. I think the spiritual Church as it is in Christ Jesus is the only hope of Romanists. As a Church organization it is a political machine and attempts to reverse a decree of our Lord, that his kingdom is not of this world. If there is any such thing as idolatry, then that so-called Church is guilty of it; and the people of this city ought to be informed of it in unmistakable terms, and the priests and devotees thus led to abandon it and become

evangelical Christians. Just as far as you proclaim the Gospel of Jesus Christ, pure and simple, just so far I wish you the most abundant blessings and success."

The election for members of the Convention to revise the Constitution of the State of New York will take place this spring, if "M. A. Corrigan, Abp." does not succeed in defeating the whole measure. The New York *Herald* of Feb. 18, foreshadows its defeat in the following dispatch from Albany: "The impression seems to be gaining ground that the chances of having a Constitutional Convention this year are getting slimmer and slimmer. Governor Hill is understood to be unwilling to sign any bill except one that provides for the election of Democratic delegates."

There are many Representatives and Senators in Albany whose principal business is to see after the interests of the Roman Catholic Church, and "Abp. Corrigan" will keep them well in hand, with the lash over them, all through the session of Legislature.

If, however, the will of the people should not be defeated, and the election should be held, we may expect some fine work on the part of Corrigan and Tammany in choosing delegates.

Ballot-box stuffing and the destruction of bags containing votes would be all for the good of the Church—"to improve the condition of the Papacy," as the Pope said in his recent letter. The fine Roman hand of the same Pope will be seen in this election of ours as plainly as it appeared in the elections just held in Germany. Will this State be ruled by Tammany Hall, Corrigan and the Pope? In the words of Colonel Shepard: "If the people go to sleep they will lose their liberty."

God and the Pope.

"As the teachings of even the 'Holy Father' seem to have no weight with you, I can only beg God to grant you grace to recognize in time the error of your ways."—Thus writes "M. A. Corrigan, Abp." to Father McGlynn under date of Nov. 26, 1886. The officers of the Inquisition used to say to their victims: "As the teachings of 'Holy Church' seem to have no weight with you, we can only beg God to show you the error of your ways while we burn you at the stake." The Roman Catholics look only to the bishops and priests for the salvation of their souls. They are absolutely dependent upon them. No priest, no sacrament; no sacrament, no salvation. Yet even Archbishop Corrigan has to appeal to God to direct Father McGlynn after he had vainly besought him in the name of the Pope. This reminds us of the Catholic woman who some years since attended one of our services in Masonic Temple, and who told the priest about it at her next confession. He said he could not give her absolution for that sin—it was a "reserved case," and Cardinal McCloskey alone had the power of absolving from such a sin. The poor woman replied that she could not go to the Cardinal; she did not think it was such a grievous sin as that.

The priest said it was, and if he gave her absolution for it he would be "compounding heresy." He thought this high-sounding phrase would frighten her, but it had a contrary effect.

"If you don't give me absolution," said she courageously, "I will not go to the Cardinal or any other priest, but will confess my sins to the great God.

Besides I am in doubt whether I committed any sin by going to the Reformed Catholic services, and I shall give myself the benefit of the doubt."

The priest remonstrated with her, but it was no use. She had heard that God had no "reserved cases" for those who sincerely repent and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and that "who-soever cometh to him, he will in no-wise cast out;" she had heard of the "Great High Priest, who is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God," and his invitation to "Come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need"; and she did not need the priest of Rome any longer to meddle with and mar the work of God. Let bishops like Corrigan continue to cry despairingly to their priests, "As the Pope cannot teach you, may God do so," and the people will turn on bishops and priests and say to them, "As you cannot teach us how to be good citizens and good Christians, we will ask God to do so. We have made gods of you and you have not blessed us; we shall now turn to our God in heaven."

DEAR SIR:

A neighbor a few days ago placed in my hands a copy of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*, in which I have become greatly interested. It is nearly three years old, but nevertheless new to me. If the same or any similar paper is still published, I should be pleased to become a subscriber.

L. N. J.

CEDAR RAPIDS, MICH.

[We are pleased to say our correspondent has since become a subscriber. We shall be happy to send sample copies to all whose names we receive.]

Saint Patrick.

Saint Patrick tells us in his Confession that he was the son of Calpornius, a Deacon, who was the son of Potitus, a Presbyter.

He began his mission in Ireland about the year A. D. 432, and on the following Easter Sunday preached the Gospel before the heathen king on the hill of Tara. It was on this occasion that he composed the following hymn, which he sang while on his way to meet the king and his chiefs :

"I bind myself to Tara to-day, the Power of God to guide me, the Might of God to uphold me, the Wisdom of God to teach me, the Eye of God to watch over me, the Ear of God to hear me, the Word of God to give me speech, the Hand of God to protect me, the Way of God to prevent me, the Shield of God to shelter me, the Host of God to defend me, against the snares of demons, against the temptations of vices, against the lusts of nature, against every man who meditates to injure me. Whether far or near, with few or with many. Christ with me, Christ before me, Christ behind me, Christ within me, Christ beneath me, Christ above me, Christ at my right, Christ at my left, Christ in the fort, Christ in the chariot-seat, Christ in the poop. Christ in the heart of every man who thinks of me, Christ in the mouth of every man who speaks of me, Christ in every eye that sees me, Christ in every ear that hears me. I bind to my-self to-day, the strong power of invocation of the Trinity, the faith of the Trinity in Unity, the Creator of the Elements. Domini est salus, Christi est salus, Salus tua Domine sit

semper nobiscum."—*Dr. Todd's Life of St. Patrick*, pp. 426-429.

The following is his Creed :

"There is no other God nor ever was nor will be after him except God the Father, without beginning ; From whom is all beginning ; Who upholds all things as we have said : And his Son Jesus Christ whom together with the Father we testify to have always existed ; Who before the beginning of the world was spiritually present with the Father ; begotten in an unspeakable manner before all beginning ; By whom were made all things visible and invisible ; Who was made man, and having overcome death was received into heaven to the Father ; And he hath given him a name which is above every name : that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow of things in heaven and things in earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess Jesus Christ is Lord and God ; In whom we believe, and we await his coming who ere long shall judge the quick and the dead : Who will render to every one according to his deeds, and has poured out abundantly on us the gift of the Holy Spirit, even the earnest of immortality, who makes those that believe and obey, to be the sons of God the Father, and joint-heirs with Christ ; Whom we confess and adore—one God in the Trinity of the sacred name."—*Confession of St. Patrick*. See Archdeacon Hamilton's version of the same, p. vii., where he describes the Creed of St. Patrick as "not unworthy of the sentiments adopted in the year 325 by the Fathers of the Council of Nice."

In his Confession or Epistle to the Irish, St. Patrick says—"I was then nearly sixteen years of age. I knew

not the true God, and I was led to Ireland in captivity. . . . And there the Lord discovered to me a sense of my unbelief, that, though late, I should remember my transgressions, and that I should be converted with my whole heart to the Lord my God; who regarded my lowliness, and had compassion upon my youth and ignorance, and took care of me before I could discern or distinguish between good and evil, and protected me and comforted me, as a father would a son."

Again—"This I know most assuredly, that as before I was humbled, I was like a stone lying in deep mud, and he, who is powerful, came, and in his mercy supported me, and indeed, raised me up and placed me on the top of a wall, and thence I ought boldly to cry out, in order to return some recompense to the Lord for his so great benefits here and forever, which the mind of man is not able to estimate."

Again—"He himself hath said by the prophet, 'Call upon me in the day of thy tribulation, and I will deliver thee, and thou shalt magnify me.'"

Again, at the close of his letter to Coroticus:—"I testify before God and his angels that it shall be so as he hath intimated to my ignorance; these are not my words, but the words of God and of the Apostles and Prophets, who never lied:—'He that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be condemned.' God said it."

St. Patrick never once addressed a prayer, or any petition, to the Virgin, or to any saint or angel. And in all his writings he never once mentions the blessed Virgin Mary.

A Roman Catholic High School.

The Roman Catholic organization of teachers known as "The Christian Brothers," has bought the valuable property on Fifty-ninth street, fronting on Central Park, for many years owned by Mr. Charlier and used as a school. "Charlier Institute" was for forty years the most famous Protestant school in New York, and was patronized by the best families. Mr. Charlier retired last year and the school was sold. Eugene Kelly, the Catholic banker, Joseph J. O'Donohue, the would-be successor of the late John Kelly as chief of Tammany Hall, and other wealthy Roman Catholics formed a "pool" to buy the property for "The Christian Brothers" and by their adroit management, coupled with promises of political preferment they succeeded in getting it for nearly half its value. It is now proposed to make it a first-class Roman Catholic high school, a feeder for the new Catholic university at Washington, D. C., that will eclipse anything of the kind in the country. It will be filled with the children of wealthy Protestants, who as graduates of "De La Salle Institute" (the new name of the institution), can be relied upon as firm friends of the Catholic Church in its future conquest of America.

The hand of M. A. Corrigan, Abp. and political commander-in-chief is again seen in this. In an interview with J. J. O'Donohue published in the *Star*, he said he would spend every dollar he had in sustaining the Archbishop. Rome has the men and the money, and if the American people continue to sleep in presence of this danger, their "cradle of liberty" will be upset and the occupant smothered.

"REVELATION," advertised on third page of cover, is a valuable work. Send for it

THE END AND THE MEANS.

The Jesuits, who are the power behind the throne in planning and directing the affairs of the Roman Catholic Church as an organization, deny that they had ever adopted as their maxim, "The End Justifies the Means." Bishop Coxe, of the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Buffalo, has had a controversy with them on this subject, which is not yet closed. Their denial that the exact words of the maxim can be found in any of their authorized writings may be true or not, but certainly their public policy and moral teachings have been crystallized in this famous saying. Abundant testimony from their theological writings has been given in the translation of Gury's "Moral Theology," which has appeared in *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* for the last two years, to warrant the statement that no words can so fitly express their methods as, "the end justifies the means." It is not known who first stamped this phrase upon their brow, and Bishop Coxe need not trouble himself about its authorship; but there it is in indelible ink, and there it will remain while the Jesuit Society exists.

The whole policy of the Church of Rome is tinctured with the same "law of expediency" that sets at naught all moral law, and seeks to establish a code of morals that would disrupt society in every country in the world. By the doctrine of "Probabilism," which is discussed at length in the "Moral Theology of the Jesuits," any crime, social or political, can be justified and made even meritorious. Reason and conscience are set aside, the only question to be considered being the adap-

tation of the means to the end. The Jesuits proudly hold up their motto, "*Ad Majorum Dei Gloriam*," "For the greater glory of God," as their only one; the "glory of God" being synonymous with the glory of the Jesuits and the power and glory of the Roman Church. Any act, good or bad in itself, that tends to the glory of "the Church" or increases its power—the end and aim of all Jesuitical energy—is not only commendable but praiseworthy. Everyone who is intimately acquainted with the methods of work in any Roman Catholic church can see many illustrations of this. In the larger sphere of Rome's public policy it is equally true. An editorial in the *New York Times* of Feb. 8, 1887, treating of the relations between Bismarck and the Pope, has the following:

"All is grist that comes to the mills of Rome. The collision between the spirit of military absolutism and the spirit of Parliamentary liberty in Germany, a contest watched with the deepest interest all over the world, and whose issue will be potent in molding the history of Europe for years to come, is viewed by the Pope merely as a welcome opportunity to improve the condition of the Roman Catholic Church in Germany.

The party of the Centre in the Reichstag is the Catholic party. Dr. Windthorst, who has been its leader throughout the long struggle against the May laws, is its leader now. He led the successful opposition to Bismarck's bill increasing the army and providing for its support for a period of seven years, commonly called the Septennate bill. When the Reichstag had rejected the bill and Bismarck had dissolved that body and a new general election had been ordered, Baron Frankenstein sent to Rome, through the Papal Nuncio at Munich, an inquiry as to the views and wishes of the Pope concerning the

conduct of Catholics in the struggle. The Pope's reply is made in a letter written by Cardinal Jacobini: "That the Septennate question embraces religious and moral considerations which justify him in expressing the opinion that he may expect from the Centre party's conciliation towards the measure a beneficial effect in the final revision of the May laws." The Pope desires, moreover, "to meet the views of Emperor William and Prince Bismarck, and thereby induce the powerful German Empire to improve the position of the Papacy."

Should Dr. Windthorst and his followers accept this Papal counsel as a command, they would be obliged to make, without other justifying reason, a complete political somersault, and support at the polls as altogether desirable a measure which in the Reichstag they had vehemently combated as oppressive, uncalled for, and monstrous.

Dr. Windthorst now declares (in an address delivered at Cologne on Saturday), that the Centre party knows what it is about much better than the Pope, and will fight the Septennate to the end. And the meeting he addressed adopted a resolution approving the course of the Catholic Deputies of the Rhine provinces and urging the re-election.

One sentence of Dr. Windthorst's address reveals with pitiless and perhaps unintentional frankness *the profound immorality of the temporal policy of the Church of Rome*. "The Pope's advocacy of the Septennate bill," said Dr. Windthorst, "was independent of the merits of the measure, and arose from reasons of expediency and from political considerations." It would be difficult to frame a more accurate analysis of the Papal motives while at the same time indicating a more sweeping denunciation of the Papal policy. Liberal principles, the right of popular government, the German constitution and its guarantee of Parliamentary institutions, says the Pope, may go to the dogs if we can secure some further modification of the

laws which relate to the Church, and so improve the condition of the Papacy in Germany.

The italics in the above are ours. The question is pertinent: If the "temporal" policy of any Church, Protestant or Catholic, be "profoundly immoral," how can its spiritual life, its moral teaching, and "eternal" policy be otherwise than immoral also? A Church whose policy, temporal or eternal, material or spiritual, is "profoundly immoral" or scandalous in the least, cannot be the Church of Christ—"who is the head of the body, the Church."

There can be no immoral policy in the Church of Christ. But there can be apostasy, and Rome has evidently entered upon the last stages of decline and departure from the Church of God. The Pope and the Jesuits will continue to build up the political power and glory of their Church by every means, even "profoundly immoral" ones, believing that they are thereby promoting the glory of God. But the sincere and honest Catholics who use their own minds and do their own thinking will also continue in larger numbers to reject a system of religion whose ethics are universally condemned. A good end does not justify bad means. And "profound immorality" exists where the means and the end are bad, as in the interference of the Pope in the elections in Germany, "to improve the condition of the Papacy," and the traitorous attempt of Archbishop Corrigan and his priests to defeat the Constitutional Convention at our last State election. There is no compromise with God. His people of old tried many times to accomplish their ends by bad means, but they were as often rebuked. Jesuit juggling defeats itself in the end.

TOM RAINEY'S EXPERIENCE.**As Narrated by himself.**

BY REV. GEO. C. NEEDHAM.

My friends, for many reasons I regret standing before you to-night. I'm too ignorant and unlearned to speak before this intelligent audience, and, moreover, it is not my calling, nor have I much gift or practice in speaking. But since the minister asked me to address you on the subject of my conversion to God, and tell of his great love to me in bringing me out of darkness into his own blessed, marvellous light, I will try to tell you "what great things he hath done for my soul."

"I was brought up a nominal Protestant, although the teaching of my young days had a good deal of the element of works in it. Of course I did not pray to the Virgin Mary, nor was I taught to do so, but in my great ignorance I was 'going about to establish my own righteousness, not submitting myself to the righteousness of God.' I was building on my prayers and good living as the best means of fetching me to heaven, thinking I was 'rich and increased with goods,' whereas my true condition was 'poor, and miserable, and blind, and naked.'

"But after all my good works, and endeavors to be religious, there was 'an aching void the world could never fill.' Humanly speaking, if the blessed story of the cross was explained to me when I was a small child, I would be brought very early to the Lord. I well remember once, when only five years old, sitting before the kitchen fire of a Sunday morning, listening to my mother, who was telling me some good, interesting

stories. My eldest sister soon entered, crying; and when my mother inquired the cause, she sobbed out and said 'O mother, the minister was preaching to-day about the end of the world, and he said that Jesus was coming to judge the wicked and punish the ungodly.' Soon as I heard my sister speak about 'the end of the world,' I began to cry and none of them could pacify me, because I felt a heavy burden on my heart, and I feared the coming of the great Judge. From that time until a young man I was the subject of many impressions and convictions, but all along was a stranger to Christ, and his precious, glorious love. But, O my friends, the good God did not leave me to myself, nor cut me off in my unbelief. Glory to his most blessed name! How can I praise him enough for having opened the eyes of my understanding and led me by a way that I knew not, until I saw the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ, and then my great load of sin was taken away, and put from me 'as far as the east is from the west.'

"I'll tell you how it happened, and I'll not detain you very long.

"A poor man was living in our neighborhood, who was noted for his profanity and wicked deeds. At one time he was missed from the parish, and we heard he was away in a foreign country. In about two years he returned, a perfectly changed character. The people wondered at him, for instead of drinking, carousing and blaspheming, he told everybody about the love of Jesus who took his sins away and gave him a new heart and a new spirit. At first the people laughed at him, and then some began to throw his past bad conduct in his face; but he took it all in good humor and used to say, 'Tis all

true, 'tis all true. I was the chiefest of sinners, but Jesus died for me.' After a while they began to listen to him more soberly and more attentively, and some of the old people took his words very much to heart, for he faithfully warned them to 'flee from the wrath to come.

"Well, I was always anxious to have a talk with this believer in Christ, as I wanted to unburden myself to somebody, and didn't know of any one in the parish who would be likely to give me relief. At last I had an opportunity. Being on an errand to his house, he kept me there all night, and when his family had retired, he brought me out under the starlit heavens, and we sat together on a cliff overhanging the strand while the waves of the ocean played beneath us. Before we exchanged a word, John McGillvary (that was his name) said, 'Let us pray;' and then, my friends, I heard prayer for the first time. Oh! never can I forget that night when this humble man wrestled with a present God for the salvation of my soul. 'Lord,' says he, 'thou didst leave thy sweet abode, thy home beyond these glittering stars, and didst pursue thy way to earth to redeem fallen humanity, and bring thy redeemed people from corruption and the power of hell. O Lord,' said he, 'as we now are resting upon the rock, safe above the ocean waves, with the brilliant stars above, I pray that thou wilt bring this poor sinner, this dear young man, to rest upon the Rock, Christ Jesus, to see the glory of his person before him, and the smile of the Father beaming upon his soul, that through the atoning blood of the holy Christ, he may be brought to rest and peace in believing.' Ah! my friends, soon as he mentioned me in his prayer, I felt my heart pant and beat against my

ribs; and when he said, 'Grant him thy salvation now,' great lumps came into my throat, and with all my heart, I cried, 'Amen, Amen.'

"After prayer, Mr. McGillvary, putting his hand on my shoulder, said, 'Tom Rainey, the Lord, I believe, is doing a work in your soul; do you believe Jesus Christ died for you?' 'I do, Mr. McGillvary,' said I. 'Well,' said he, 'what good has his death done you?' 'O Mr. McGillvary,' said I, 'didn't it atone for my sin?' 'True,' said he, 'and if you believe that, you're a saved man. 'Twas for that he died, to make atonement for the transgressors; and when we believe in him, when we trust him, when we cast our souls entirely on his merits, on his death, on his blood we are safe,' said he, stamping his foot upon the rock, 'safe, because it is God's plan of saving; he justifieth him that believeth in Jesus.'

"It was then, my friends, I had a glimpse of the blessed Redeemer, between two thieves, bearing my accumulated load of guilt upon his own dear body, and receiving all the punishment I deserved, in order to deliver me from condemnation. My friends, why should I doubt my acceptance with God in Christ? Why should I doubt my salvation? he is no imperfect Saviour; his work is no mean work; his blood is no worthless blood; it has touched my conscience, and has purged away my guilt. Why should I doubt God's love to sinners, or the truth which declares 'he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life?' Oh, far be it from me to doubt the certainty of everlasting life! When God's word is broken, then

my soul is forever lost. But, hallelujah to God and the Lamb, 'the heavens and the earth will pass away, but the word of the Lord endureth forever. And this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you.'

"And excuse me for saying that I think you who pray 'to be saved in the kingdom hereafter,' are robbing your souls of the enjoyment of being saved now. Oh, why dishonor his dear name with 'ifs,' and 'perhaps,' and 'hopes,' and 'maybes?' Away with them, my friends, away with them! If you have Christ, you may be certain of it, but if you have not Christ, you have neither salvation, nor the joy it imparts. Why did John write his first epistle? In chapter v. 13, he tells us, 'that ye may know that ye have eternal life.' Whatever self-indulgent, self-righteous, worldly-minded and professing Christians and cold church-members may say against our being assured of salvation in the blessed Jesus, see to it that you stick to the Bible, and by your joy and peace in the Holy Ghost convince them you cannot be shaken from your solid and secure foundation; and when Satan tempts you to doubt God's love and Christ's work, show him the Scriptures which cannot be broken, and you'll soon scare him back to his den. It has been my privilege to rejoice in the Lord since the day of my conversion, now five years ago, and I am more fully persuaded than ever that what he has promised he is able also to perform. I know Satan may wound my faith, but he cannot touch my life, because it is 'hid with Christ in God, beyond the reach of harm,' and I am content to leave it there, and go on my way rejoicing. The Lord bless you all, for his name's sake. Amen."

Typical Catholic Saints.

BY LEO REED.

In Syria there once lived a pious monk named Simon. Twenty years of his life had been passed in or near Jerusalem in prayer, fasting and other works of penance. But like many others who have tried to earn heaven by works of this kind, Simon must have had serious doubts as to their sufficiency. He returned to his native city, Edessa, and after much deliberation, hit upon a novel plan for securing his salvation. Simon thought that as the Saviour had endured the contempt of men, so his disciple should also be held in slight regard by others. And he concluded as the most effective method of lowering himself in the esteem of his fellow-men, to act in future as though bereft of reason; in other words, to act as a lunatic. His conclusion, like his mind, was unsonnd. Insanity is regarded with pity, not contempt.

With great courage, so runs the story, Simon forthwith proceeded to carry out his project. In all the affairs of life his conduct became that of a confirmed lunatic, only, it is added, he carefully avoided everything liable to occasion sin. At first perhaps people paid little attention to this monk's antics, but presently he achieved a signal success. Without the city he found on a dung-hill the carcass of a dead dog. [I have no desire to ridicule the memory of the misguided man who no doubt was in reality what he pretended to be—a lunatic, and who has had the additional misfortune of being accounted a Roman Catholic "Saint." But to convey a fair idea of the grossness of Romish superstitious as taught *to-day*, I render

the disgusting details precisely as they occur in the original German:—"Unter anderen trafer auszer der Stadt auf einem Misthaufen einen todten Hund an. Diesen band er an einen Strick den er um den Leib hatte, und zog ihn durch die Gassen der Stadt mit allerlei lacherlichen Geberden."

Weninger's *Legende der Heiligen*, Vol., II, p. 2.]

This unsightly object Simon fastened to a rope which he wore about his waist and with various absurd gestures dragged it through the streets of Edessa. The children who were just returning from school greeted the "holy" procession with yells of delight and derision, pelted it with mud and stones and chased it from street to street. From all this Simon derived supreme enjoyment. We are told that our monk continued to the end of his life to act the *role* he had chosen. Occasionally he joined the children in their sports, sat down with them in the street, helped them to build toy houses and (presumably) to make mud pies. At other times he occupied an elevation by the wayside and pelted the passers by with nuts and pebbles.

At length Simon died. His body was found covered with a few twigs in the miserable hut which had been his only shelter during life. Many people gathered and the "ignorant multitude" (unwissende Menge) said "he died as he lived—a fool." But Simon's confessor, who was present, took them to task and revealed the hitherto strangely disguised sanctity of his spiritual son. Great miracles followed at his grave and elsewhere through Simon's intercession. His case were finally carried to Rome, where he was duly pronounced a saint. His feast is celebrated on July 1st.

That a downright lunatic should have found a place in the Romish calendar need not excite surprise. But that his mad freaks should be pointed out with pride, and emphasized as evidences of divine grace, may well seem incredible. Yet my authority is not a malicious heretic or infidel. Neither am I guilty of raking up the worst of those countless monkish fables of the dark ages occasionally referred to in history as "rubbish," "cobwebs" etc., but otherwise nowadays forgotten.

The foregoing is taken from a German edition of "The Lives of the Saints" by Dr. F. X. Weninger, a work which can be had in any German Catholic book store. The title page informs you that the work is expressly desinged to meet the wants of the Catholics of North America. And who is Dr. F. X. Weninger? He is a priest of the "Society of Jesus," a Doctor of Theology, a voluminous author of high repute in his Church and probably the foremost German Missionary in this country. Indeed in Catholic circles it might almost be said of Dr. Weninger, "his fame doth fold in the orb o' this earth." This man is a shining light in that famous, and infamous order, the members of which in their vows promise to exercise "peculiar care in the education of boys," and who control not less than twenty-eight of the eighty-five Catholic colleges in the United States. And every one of the Jesuit "Professors" in these institutions, whatever his private opinion on the subject, is ready so demonstrate to the "ignorant multitude," that an insane monk who proved his humility and established his sanctity by dragging a dead dog through the streets of a great city, was and is a great saint, worthy of worship and invocation by all men.

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC.

This magazine has a distinct field to work in and a well-defined work to do. Briefly, it is—to enlighten the American people on the iniquities and dangers of the Romish system of religion, and to convert the Roman Catholics into good Christians and good citizens. This is a big undertaking, but its magnitude has not deterred us. For the last eight years we have been preaching on this subject in one of the finest halls in New York, and the pen has been even busier than the tongue. Before we commenced this publication, we wrote hundreds of articles that were widely published in different papers. We received no payment for those articles. We did not ask any; but we confess if payment were tendered we would not refuse it, for we needed money, and need it still to carry on our work. We began the publication of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* without any capital save the proceeds of a few weeks' lecture tour in Iowa and Minnesota, where we had been invited to speak at Sunday school assemblies in the summer of 1883. The little monthly has grown in size and, we trust, in usefulness since its birth, paying its own way almost from the start, as we did all the work ourself, except the mechanical part of printing, and closely watched the expenditure of every cent.

The subscription list has increased each year, but so have our expenses; and if the magazine will only pay its way this year like the preceding ones, it is because the circulation has not reached up to the point where it would contribute to the support of our general work. This state of things our present subscribers and readers can

remedy by interesting their friends and thus swelling our list. We have no means for advertising or hiring agents to work up an interest in it. We depend upon friends—and we are sure every reader is a friend—to do this for us. Ask your friends to subscribe, and they will do so. If they refuse, ask them again. Send to us for as many copies as you need and place them where they will do the most good. We now send out every month hundreds of copies to do missionary work, and if our increased circulation will warrant it, we will send out thousands.

We are in the thick of the fight and will work while it is day, bearing all the responsibility of contending in behalf of the Catholic people themselves against their greatest enemy. When the night cometh and we can work no more, we know that victory shall be written on our standard, for the Lord of Hosts is with us and the prayers of his people continually go up to him for our success.

We cannot turn *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* aside from its special field of labor to solicit in its columns contributions for any purpose other than its distribution. To do so would be to make it a begging circular, and thereby hinder its usefulness. With God's blessing it shall continue on the course hitherto pursued, relying on the Divine guidance for direction.

Our brother, Rev. John C. Collins, and others have counselled us to set apart a column for the acknowledgment of contributions received for the "Special List" of subscribers inaugurated by him, and for our "Free List." This we would be glad to do if we thought it would be successful and agreeable to our readers.

What Our Subscribers say.

DEAR BROTHER O'CONNOR :

As to my subscription, you can put me down as a *perpetual* subscriber 'till I notify you to stop sending it. And if behind at any time attribute it to oversight and send me a card. One dollar per year for THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC is my best spent dollar. I cannot do without it.

The journal is doing a grand work for God and humanity, a work that will abide. You are not building on the foundation "wood, hay and stubble," but precious stones of abiding truth, and your "labor will not be in vain in the Lord."

May you and your good work abound more and more.

Yours fraternally,

(Rev.) J. E. EICHELBERGER.

W. Va. Conference, M. E. Church.
ST. CLOUD, W. Va.

DEAR SIR :

I received your kind letter informing me that you would send me THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC whether I was able to pay for it or not. I don't know how to thank you for your kindness. I am greatly interested in your work for the conversion of Catholics, for I have one near and dear to me a pervert to the Church of Rome. Words cannot express my grief when I see her holding a faith which teaches that there is no salvation out of its communion.

As I said before I don't know what to say. I am so thankful for your offer to send me the book without any pay. I have shown the numbers that I have received to some of my friends and

they think it is a lovely book. I shall try to get some subscribers.

Very truly yours,

J. A. F.

LOWELL, Mass, Feb, 13, 1887.

DEAR BROTHER O'CONNOR.

I was made glad of heart upon receipt of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC. Though not a convert from the Romish Church myself, I feel an interest in THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC and companion works, such as I rarely have felt in publications of any kind in our country.

I believe heaven's hosts rejoice at the inauguration of such a work on the earth, because thereby and therein the name of our blessed Lord and only Saviour, Jesus Christ, is exalted above every other name in heaven and in earth, and he as our great high priest is honored and glorified.

In him is the light and the life which is eternal, *and he alone* hath power to forgive sins on earth. I shall continue to work for the enlargement of your subscription list—the wider circulation of such publications as tend to the opening of the eyes of the blind, both in and out of the Romish Church; and may God's blessing be upon your every good word and work in giving him all the honor and glory. Yours in Christ.

J. M. M., M.D.

EAST PORTLAND, Or., Jan. 28, 1887.

A missionary in Ceylon, India, writes:

After a good deal of fruitless effort to obtain your magazine, I have at last succeeded. Of the half-dozen distinctively Protestant periodicals I take, I like THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC best.

Correspondence on the McGlynn Case.

REV. JAMES A. O'CONNOR,

Rev. and Dear Sir :

Your theory as to the grounds of the peremptory action of the Vatican in the case of Dr. McGlynn appears to me correct. His attitude on the school question is the chief reason influencing the authorities to deal with him. But with consummate craft, the stroke is directed against him rather as an abettor of communism, so that in punishing him Rome hopes at the same time to win for herself the credit of standing between the property owners and the spoliators. Thus she hopes to gain favor with the moneyed classes and with the sober portion of the community, while at the same time she ruins one whom on other grounds she dislikes. She knows very well that in this country it is safe to take sides with the sober and orderly against the upsetters of order ; that while by doing so she may lose some, she will gain more, and those having means to reward her. It may be that I am uncharitable in thus judging, but it is the doom of a deceiver, one proved to be such, that he is apt to be suspected even when he acts in good faith.

With earnest wishes for your success in rescuing many from Roman thralldom, I am yours truly,

(Rev.) JAMES HARPER.

XENIA, Ohio, Feb. 10. 1887.

DEAR BROTHER O'CONNOR :

We are much interested in Father McGlynn's case and shall be to the end. Oh, that he would come out altogether from the darkness of error and the superstition of Romanism, into the glorious light and liberty of the Gospel

of peace, comfort, hope and heaven. Ay, to be a free man in Christ Jesus, who says ; "And ye shall know the *Truth* and the *Truth* shall make you free." "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." His benign and blessed words "they are spirit, and they are life." How they cheer us on our way, whether it be bright and sunny or sometimes under a cloudy veil.

I would like, if you think it advisable, to send Father McGlynn a New Testament, with special passages of the Everlasting Gospel marked for his study.

I must not forget to say we think him utterly wrong and out of the way in the land question. Bible study would set him right on that. Why did Israel's great law-giver say "Cursed is every one that moveth his neighbor's landmark, and all the people shall say Amen." Very sincerely,

Mrs. J. W. C

WOODSTOCK, N. H., Feb. 12, 1887.

DEAR SIR :

We are deeply interested in the work in which you are engaged, and pray for your success in opening the eyes of both Catholics and Protestants to the evils of Romanism. We hope Dr. McGlynn may cast off the yoke of Popery, and accept that yoke of Christ which is easy and his burden which is light.

We trust God will continue to bless you in all your labors. We read your magazines with great interest and send them where they will do good. Yours, with prayers for your work.

M. V. BALL,

Editor of "Home Guardian."

BOSTON, MASS., Feb. 14, 1887.

DEAR SIR :

I have read with wonder the declaration of independence made in the Cooper Union meeting reported in *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*. It seems like a dream that Roman Catholics have given utterance to such sentiments. Every loyal heart must thank God and take courage at such an awakening as the case of Father McGlynn has occasioned.

Would that all Protestant clergymen might preach as boldly against Romanism as does Rev. J. D. Fulton and yourself. I wish every minister and layman might read his sermon that you published in your last issue.

Mrs. E. S. H.

CORTLAND, N. Y., Feb. 14, 1887.

DEAR SIR :

The February number of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* contained a fuller history of the Father McGlynn matter than I have seen elsewhere. I have hope that the Lord is going to use his case to open the eyes of the Catholics to see more clearly their bondage to the Popish system.

Very truly yours,

AVERY T. NORTHROP.

FRANKLIN, N. Y., Feb. 14, 1887.

DEAR SIR :

We are watching the case of Father McGlynn with the greatest interest, although not approving his views on the land question, yet admiring his independence. It is well that he does not go to Rome, and better yet if he would come out of Rome. If he were to do so, what a multitude would follow him out of that Babylon, what a blow to Popery in New York he could deal,

judging from his influence over his parishioners.

C. B. K.

ST. JOHNSBURY, VT., Jan. 26, 1887.

DEAR MR. O'CONNOR:

We are glad you speak so kindly of Father McGlynn. Even if he never comes out of Rome, it seems as if he had done great good already by leading his people to think for themselves. He appears to be an unconscious ally of Protestantism.

M. I. A.

TROY, N. Y., Feb. 15, 1887.

DEAR SIR :

We are watching the McGlynn movement with interest. Many Catholics in New York have spoken "boldly and bravely." The Pope will find America not so easy to conquer in the future.

He has only heard a few speak, what will he and his Jesuits think when the 50,000,000 act as well as speak?

M. S.

NEWTON, MASS., Feb. 13, 1887.

ONE OF OUR CORRESPONDENTS writes: Please don't put anything I write in your magazine again; I don't think anything I write is worth it. [If it were not worth it, kind correspondent, we would not print it, though we can not print all the letters that come to our office. In future, however, where letters are of general interest, we shall gladly publish them. If our correspondents do not wish their names to appear, they must notify us. But it must be remembered that anonymous letters are valueless, and that those with initials only have not as much weight as have those with the full name.]

A STATEMENT FROM FATHER McGLYNN.

Archbishop Corrigan having seen fit to publish a statement giving letters and parts of letters relating to me, I now supplement this publication with such documents concerning the censures upon my course as I have been able to lay my hands upon, accompanying them with some necessary explanation.

Archbishop Corrigan in his statement says truly that on May 26, 1883, Cardinal McCloskey suggested that I might if I chose take a summer vacation in the form of a trip to Rome, and thus have an opportunity of making in person a more satisfactory explanation to the cardinal prefect of Propaganda. As this suggestion was made through Archbishop Corrigan I sent to him the following letter:

ST. STEPHEN'S CHURCH,)
NEW YORK, June 1, 1883. }

Most Reverend and Dear Archbishop: I send by this post a letter to Cardinal McCloskey, such as he desired you to ask from me.

I do not desire to avail myself of the Cardinal's permission to take a summer vacation in the shape of a trip to Rome. My absence at this time would cause a serious interruption and derangement of efforts and plans for the further diminution of the debt of this church. This urgent duty and also the very subject matter of this correspondence impress upon me with peculiar emphasis and in more senses than one the value of the maxim that charity begins *at home*. I am, most reverend and dear archbishop, very sincerely, your obedient servant in Domino,

EDWARD MCGLYNN.

[We omit parts of the "Statement" not of general interest.]

Before going further, I would state that among those who denounced me to Rome for my land league speeches were Bishops Gilmour of Cleveland, and Chatard of Indianapolis, the former the owner and the latter the apologist of the famous or infamous Cincinnati pastoral letter, which was in a great measure a deliberate thesis against the declaration of independence.

Other bishops, as opportunity offered, did not fail to manifest their intolerance. I will illustrate this by a letter, which shows that on flimsy pretenses they would interfere with the right of a priest to address public meetings that could not be said to be even of a political character. On the 15th of March last year, I went, at the request of Archbishop Corrigan, to Washington, to recommend to President Cleveland Brig. Gen. John Newton of the engineers for promotion to a vacant major-generalship. On my return I found a letter from Archbishop Corrigan which, though marked "private," I here publish. I feel myself no longer under any obligation of secrecy, since while I was keeping silence the archbishop published a long series of letters concerning me, all of which by their very nature should have been considered private. The following is the letter referred to:

[Private.]

452 MADISON AV., NEW YORK,)
March, 15, 1886.)

Rev. Dear Doctor—The bishop of Brooklyn has called to direct attention to the enclosed circular, in which you are announced to speak at a meeting presided over by Henry Ward Beecher.

As the meeting is to be held in his diocese, the bishop objects vehemently to a Catholic priest publicly appearing in such company, inasmuch as he conceives that great disedification and scandal will be the result.

At his request I make his views known to you, and I am forced to say that I too would feel humiliated to find a priest of the arch-diocese openly associating with Mr. Beecher, and even Howard Crosby, who only last year insulted us all by saying that our country would rise in its might against Romanists and crush them into dust because we simply asked that our poor children be permitted, according to the constitution, to worship God with liberty of conscience.

I am, Rev. dear Doctor,

Very truly yours,

M. A. CORRIGAN.

I answered the foregoing letter as follows:

ST. STEPHEN'S CHURCH,)
NEW YORK, March 17, 1886. }

Most Reverend and Dear Archbishop:

I received a telegram from General Newton on Thursday evening conveying thanks for my intended journey to Washington in his behalf, but saying that his chances seemed so slight that he could hardly wish me to go. I deferred the trip, and next morning I received a letter from him in the same sense. On further reflection I felt that I should go, to give him whatever additional chance my visit might, and to leave nothing undone to gratify your wish. I went on Sunday night, saw Gen. Newton, and the President, and the result, though not absolutely promising success, was very gratifying to the General, and much more favorable than either he or I expected. I returned

on Monday night at 11 o'clock, and then found your letter telling me of the bishop of Brooklyn's visit and protest against my speaking at the meeting of the Brooklyn Excise League. It pained me to learn from you that you would feel humiliated by my openly associating with Mr. Beecher, who was to preside, and even with Dr. Howard Crosby. But as you did not forbid me to go, probably doubting your right to do so, nor even advise me in such delicate circumstances to break my engagement, and as you marked your letter "*private*" I would have had to cause a public scandal by breaking so important an engagement without being at liberty to give the reasons. The scandal would have been much increased by the more or less accurate surmises as to the cause, and no doubt by the speedy publication of the true cause, which publication, no matter how great might be my reticence, would probably come about through the indiscretion of friends of Bishop Loughlin himself. I, therefore, determined to keep my engagement, and all the more readily, as I was confident both from general principles and from several past experiences of my own in similar matters that your apprehensions and those of the bishop of Brooklyn would not be verified. As a matter of fact, my presence on that platform drew from both Mr. Beecher and Dr. Crosby strong and eloquent testimonies in favor of the Catholic Church. My joining with these men was to promote the cause of law in the interest of morality and temperance, and in keeping with the spirit of the Council of Baltimore, which was quoted with great approval by Dr. Crosby. I felt that in doing this I surely was not making any com

promise with alleged faults in Mr. Beecher's private character, nor with Dr. Crosby's utterances on the freedom of worship bill. Besides, we would do well to remember that a jury, after a long trial, failed to find the allegations against Mr. Beecher true, and that it is a wise maxim both in church and in society which says, "*da locum penitentiae*." We should also remember that Mr. Beecher is to-day regarded as one of the greatest and most illustrious of Americans, and that his advocacy of any good cause is a tower of strength to it. As to Dr. Crosby, he will not improbably lose a good deal of his asperity in consequence of such meetings as that between him and me last evening, and between him and Father Walworth a few weeks ago, in Albany, in the interest of the excise bill. I can conceive it as not impossible that a few friendly talks between us might remove his objections entirely. I may mention as pertinent to the subject that it was stated by leading physicians of the department of charities that the vacant commissionership in that department was offered by our Catholic Mayor Grace to the same Dr. Crosby.

It may be well in similar matters to remember the recent example of the Pope, who sent to an arch-persecutor of the church the decoration of the order of Christ, and of whom the newspapers said a few days ago that he had sent a special courier to thank Bismarck for some complimentary remarks made in an after-dinner speech. I may mention that I took occasion to explain and justify this action of the Pope at a recent meeting of the Nineteenth Century club, in answer to the not at all bitter remark of one of the speakers, who, regretting the non-fulfil-

ment of the Christian hopes of peace in the world, said: "And the Pope the other day sent the decoration of the order of Christ to Prince Bismarck, who is surely not the prince of peace." I sent a telegram to Bishop Loughlin last evening, before starting for the meeting, telling him that he would receive a letter from me to-day making explanations. The letter to him will consist of an extract of this letter to you, containing the whole of it except what relates to my trip to Washington. I remain, most reverend and dear archbishop, very sincerely, your obedient servant in Christ.

EDWARD MCGLYNN.

Most Rev. Archbishop Corrigan.

The next day I received the following:

452 MADISON AVENUE,)
NEW YORK, March 18, 1886.)

Rev. Dear Doctor:

I am very much indebted to you for your kindness in making the trip to Washington, and for your good offices in behalf of General Newton.

I am, dear doctor,

Very faithfully yours,

M. A. CORRIGAN.

Archbishop Corrigan has said in his statement:

"Having resumed the practice of speaking in political gatherings, Dr. McGlynn was gently reminded, Aug. 21, 1886, of the impropriety of such conduct."

The only political gathering that I can remember at which I spoke shortly before the date of Archbishop Corrigan's letter of Aug. 21, was the great labor demonstration on July 5th in Union Square, in favor of Gladstone and Parnell, during the parliamentary election. I confess it did not occur to

me that any one would at that date hold me bound by the voluntary promise I had made three or four years before, since Rome itself had been forced to change its attitude toward the Irish question, and since even Archbishop Corrigan had at last deemed it politic no longer to oppose the movement in aid of the land of his parents.

SUSPENDED.

On Sept. 20, 1886, I received a letter from the archbishop, in which occurs the following clause :

"As your bishop, I now forbid you in the most positive manner to attend the proposed meeting in Chickering hall on Friday night, or to take part in future in any political meeting whatever without the sanction of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda Fide."

I felt it to be my duty to disregard this prohibition, and on the day of the meeting I sent to the archbishop a letter which I cannot now find, in which I said that as I had made the engagement before receiving the letter, and had been very extensively advertised to speak, my failure to keep the engagement would precipitate a public scandal and be of grave injury to the cause, and would be in the nature of a breach of contract which I did not feel at liberty to make, and something very different from what it would have been if I had simply declined, when invited, to attend the meeting ; that I therefore thought it better to keep my engagement, while assuring him that I would respect his prohibition during the rest of Mr. George's canvass.

The next day, Oct. 2, I received a letter from the archbishop, which he has published, and by which he sus-

pended me from all sacerdotal functions for the space of two weeks. I religiously respected this suspension, and yet he and his vicar-general, Preston, cast discredit on me by informing people of the suspension and circulating the false rumor that I had continued, in disregard of the suspension, to say mass.

In that part of his paper which he marks "seventh" the archbishop says :

"Next came the sad sight of a Catholic priest riding in an open barouche from poll to poll on election day."

What law, human or divine, forbade me so to do? If it was a somewhat unusual thing, yet I was impelled to it by a sense of justice as a partial offset to the influence of the widely published political manifesto of Monsignor Preston addressed to the chairman of the Tammany hall committee on resolutions, and also as a much-needed protest against the denunciations which had been hurled from several Catholic altars against Mr. George and his party on the Sunday before the election; *against the abuse of the confessional*, in which men had been coerced from attending Mr. George's meetings by the threat of the refusal of absolution; and against the influence which the archbishop had brought to bear upon clergymen to induce them to do what they could to defeat the Constitutional Convention, which the best interests of the state and the convictions of a great majority of the people imperatively demanded.

The archbishop tells how I was again suspended by him on Nov. 26, because of a reporter's talk about me in the *Tribune*.

The following is the archbishop's letter concerning that interview :

NEW YORK, NOV. 26, 1886.
Rev. Dr. McGlynn, Rector of St.
Stephen's Church:

Rev. Dear Sir—This morning's *Tribune* publishes an interview in which you speak so offensively of our holy father, Pope Leo XIII. (although without mention of his name), that I am painfully forced once more to have recourse to ecclesiastical censure to keep you within proper bounds. By to-morrow's steamer your words, as reported in the *Tribune*, will go to the cardinal-prefect of Propaganda, and making allowance for time to hear from him I hereby withdraw your faculties and suspend you from all sacerdotal functions from the date of this letter until the end of the present year.

At the same time I place the Rev. Dr. Curran in temporary charge of St. Stephen's Church, conveying to him by another letter, of even date, all necessary powers to act as administrator, both in temporals and spirituals, for the time being and until further notice.

As the teachings of even the Holy Father seem to have no weight with you, I can only humbly beg God to grant you grace to recognize in time the error of your ways. I am, rev. dear sir,

Very truly yours in Christ,

M. A. CORRIGAN,
Archbishop of New York.

The same day I sent to the archbishop by the hand of my friend, the Rev. Dr. Curran, the following:

ST. STEPHEN'S CHURCH, }
NOV. 26, 1886. }

Most Rev. and Dear Archbishop: In your letter of this date you seem to have fallen into misapprehension which I think it well to correct. The words in the *Tribune* are not mine. During my conversation with the writer for

that paper he did not take a note. I did not mention the Pope, nor think of him, nor of any utterance of his. What I did say could be summed up in the truism that prevention is better than cure. Very respectfully your obedient servant in Christ.

E. MCGLYNN.

In my card to the *Tribune* of Dec. 3, which the archbishop calls a quasi retraction, but in which I really retracted nothing, I explained and affirmed what I had said to the reporter. I showed how the desire to do justice through social readjustments did not conflict with the true view of Christian charity, and I quoted from my recent lecture in Jersey City on "A Christian View of the Labor Question." It may not be entirely impertinent to give here a letter which that lecture called forth from Bishop Wigger of Newark, which was sent to me, with the endorsement as printed below, by Archbishop Corrigan. It is as follows:

SETON HALL COLLEGE, }
SOUTH ORANGE, NOV. 13, 1886. }

Your Grace—Will you kindly notify the Rev. Dr. McGlynn of St. Stephen's Church, in my name, that for the future he is not to preach or lecture in my diocese? I do not at all admire the principles he holds concerning property, &c. Some of them are very strange, not to say heretical.

With great respect, I remain,

Yours very sincerely,

W. M. WIGGER,
Bishop of Newark.

To the Most Rev. Dr. Corrigan,
Archbishop of New York.

Rev. Dear Doctor—As the above note is sufficiently explicit, it is unnecessary for me to add anything to it

beyond the expression of sincere regret. Very truly yours,

M. A. CORRIGAN.

I sent to Archbishop Corrigan a clipping of the card in the *Tribune* of Dec. 3. The next day I received from him the following :

452 MADISON AVENUE, }
NEW YORK, Dec. 4, 1886. }

Rev. Dear Doctor—His eminence, Cardinal Simeoni, by cablegram received this moment, orders you to proceed immediately to Rome. The words of the despatch are: "Alumnus McGlynn immediate Romam profisciscatur. Cardinalis Præfectus." I am, reverend dear sir, very truly yours,

M. A. CORRIGAN.

Two weeks later I received the following :

NEW YORK, Dec. 18, 1886,

Reverend Dear Sir: Two weeks have now elapsed since you received the cablegram from Card. Simeoni directing you to report immediately to Rome.

I have not yet heard that you intend to obey this summons, and I now write to inquire *specifically* what you propose to do in the premises, as I wish to take such further action for the church of St. Stephen as I may deem proper in view of your presence or absence. I am, Rev. dear doctor, faithfully yours,

M. A. CORRIGAN, Abp.

Rev. Dr. McGlynn.

To this I answered as follows :

NEW YORK, Dec. 20, 1886.

Most Rev. and Dear Archbishop: I find that I shall not be able to go to Rome. There are several personal reasons, any one of which must be sufficient. I have had reason to feel concerned about my health for some

time, and my physician orders me not to undertake the journey. [Here follows other reasons.]

A few days later I received this card :

452 MADISON AVENUE, }
NEW YORK, Jan. 6, 1887. }

Reverend Dear Doctor: Please call to see me this evening or to-morrow morning, as I have a letter to you from Cardinal Simeoni.

Very truly yours,

M. A. CORRIGAN.

The archbishop says: "He was invited to call and receive it, but refused—'I will not come to see you.'!" The full text of my reply puts the matter in a somewhat different light.

210 EAST 105TH STREET, }
NEW YORK, Jan. 7, 1887. }

I have received your note asking me to call to see you, as you have a letter to me from Cardinal Simeoni. I am indisposed and I will not call to see you. You may send the letter to me at the above address, where I shall be for several days.

The letter of Cardinal Simeoni, which the archbishop describes as a "most kind and conciliatory" one, mingles with some flattery severe reproaches for my former utterances. And yet before I could have reasonably been expected to start for Rome I am censured for the delay, and am practically told that my case is already prejudged in Rome, as it has been most effectually prejudged in New York by my suspension from priestly functions and my sudden expulsion from my church and home. Cardinal Simeoni ends his letter with the threat that if I should fail to go "he would be placed under the painful necessity of having recourse to measures and of adopting

provisions which surely would be unpleasant for me." These threats of the cardinal might have had more weight with me if the unpleasant things which he threatens had not already been inflicted on me, so that it is hard to imagine what other or more unpleasant things he could devise.

The story of my expulsion from St. Stephen's by Archbishop Corrigan and his agent, the Rev. A. J. Donnelly, has been sufficiently told in the archbishop's published letter and in many other published reports.

On Jan. 16, after Cardinal Simeoni received Archbishop Corrigan's statement, he sent the following telegram to the archbishop.

[The translation is the archbishop's.]

"Give orders to have Dr. McGlynn again invited to proceed to Rome, and also to condemn in writing the doctrines to which he has given utterance in public meetings or which have been attributed to him in the press. Should he disobey, use your own authority in dealing with him."

The next day another dispatch from Cardinal Simeoni said :

"The Pontiff commands the alumnus to come to Rome at once."

One sufficient answer to all this strange urgency has already been given; but I now have further to say :

In becoming a priest I did not evade the duties nor surrender the rights of a man and a citizen. I deny the right of Bishop, Propaganda, or Pope, to punish me for my actions as a man and a citizen. I deny their right to censure me, or to punish me for my opinions in political economy, unless they can show that these opinions are clearly contrary to the teachings of the Christian religion. This they have not shown, and I

know that they cannot show it. I have not appealed to Rome from the judgments of the archbishop, and I have no desire to do so. *I deny the right of Bishop, Propaganda, or Pope, to order me to Rome.* The "vow of obedience" of the priest, of which so many absurd things have been said within the last few weeks, is simply a promise to obey the church authorities in matters concerning the priest's duties of religion. It were monstrous to imagine that this promise has not clear and well-defined limitations. My obligation, taken as a student of the Propaganda, was not, as some seem to imagine, to go wherever and to do whatever that institution should see fit to command, but simply to return to my native place and there devote myself to the ministry of religion.

In an interview published in the *World* during the late municipal canvass I took occasion, from Monsignor Preston's political letter, to admonish him and other ecclesiastical dignitaries of the grave danger of repeating the folly and the shame of condemning scientific truth as religious heresy — a shame and a folly of which their predecessors had been guilty in the condemnation of Galileo and Copernicus. It seems that they are fated to repeat this crime and blunder, and to add another to the many reasons that have made men look upon Ecclesiastical Authority as one of the greatest foes of scientific progress, of national development, and of rational liberty, and in large part *a hindrance, rather than a help, in the way of bringing to the whole world the light, the purity and the comfort that come from the teachings and the ministrations of Christ.*

EDWARD MCGLYNN.

THE PRESS ON FATHER McGLYNN'S CASE.

Almost without exception the press of the country has been on the side of Archbishop Corrigan and the Pope against Father McGlynn in the great fight he and his followers are waging against the iniquities, political, moral, and religious, of the Church of Rome. It is easy to account for this. All the papers are political organs, and Father McGlynn had taken sides with the people's party against the old political "rings" at the last election in New York. The press is always conservative and in favor of the strongest party in contests where it is not directly concerned.

If Germany in the sixteenth century had as powerful a press as America has in our day, Martin Luther and his brave followers could not have accomplished the great work of the Reformation. The progress of religious liberty would have been slower and Rome's power would be greater than it is today. For this reason, apart from others, the McGlynn fight for liberty and American freedom is all the harder and more difficult; but we believe in its ultimate victory, though mayhap not in his hands, as devoutly as we believe in the good that has been wrought by previous "rebellions against Rome."

Among the few papers, secular or religious, that have treated the McGlynn case fairly, the *Independent* has been conspicuous. Besides its editorials, it has published two remarkable articles (Jan. 27, and Feb. 3), by a "Roman Catholic Layman," the first of which we present to our readers as the best that has appeared on the subject.

The Case of Father McGlynn.

BY A ROMAN CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Not the least remarkable and noteworthy feature of this remarkable and noteworthy case, has been the stand which the press has taken against the priest. I have been at the trouble to read the observations of the principal New York daily papers on this subject, and without exception they have taken the side of Bishop Corrigan. The line taken by the American press in this matter is curious, and this unanimity must have a common origin. To any one at all acquainted with the *personnel* of the New York daily press the fact that a very considerable number, literary and mechanical, of the working staff of our dailies are Catholics is one way of accounting for it.

The most careless observer of ecclesiastical affairs cannot fail to note that the policy of Catholic ecclesiastical authority has always been to practice the strictest concealment of ecclesiastical doings. To use a common but expressive phrase, they wash their soiled linen in private. No doubt it is a very wise policy to hide family defects within the family circle, but there are subjects on which the public has a right to be informed.

We are all human, and the temptation is great, even to the best of men, to exercise arbitrary power, when the exercise of power is irresponsible and secret,

The case of Father McGlynn is by no means of rare occurrence in the Catholic Church; but such cases are concealed with a secrecy which would scarcely be credited by the general public.

If a case similar to that of Dr. McGlynn had occurred in France or England, public opinion, rightly or wrongly would have sided with him, and supported him with no ordinary determination. It is curious that in Republican and free America he should be practically "sat upon."

Let us place ourselves, for a moment, in the position of a Catholic priest. I believe that there are hundreds of priests, and, taking in the whole Catholic Church, I might say that there are thousands, who would never have become priests if they had realized to what they were committing themselves by their ordination vows.

The truth is, that ecclesiastical discipline is in the hands of mortal men who have many temptations to the exercise of tyranny. Hence they can do what is most unjust even with a show of justice, and may appear to be acting for the best interests of the Church when they are simply indulging some of the worst passions of human nature.

It is by no means a new question in the Catholic Church, as to how far a priest can take part in political affairs, and even Catholic laymen have little idea of all the bitterness and heart-burning which this subject has caused.

In Ireland, not so long ago, bishop was arrayed against bishop, an archbishop against a cardinal. Archbishop Croke denounced Cardinal McCabe in the public press, and all the old-time policy and adroitness of Roman ecclesiastical statesmanship was needed to prevent the greatest public scandal.

In America where the Catholic hierarchy are conservative to a man, such trouble could never arise. To a philosophic mind, not greatly concerned one way or another with opinions or the

causes of such men's mode of action, the outcome is amusing. To a man who studies mankind not merely as an abstract metaphysical subject, but as one should do who feels all that touches humanity because he also is human, it is a subject for bitter grief.

The Catholic bishops exercise a great deal of political power, and they can practically compel their clergy to silence if not to active exertion, no matter what the private opinion of the priest may be.

Indeed, the statement has been made, and has not been contradicted, that Dr. McGlynn was not censured or hindered when he spoke quite recently for Archbishop Corrigan's candidate for President. It has also been stated publicly that Archbishop Corrigan has himself taken a prominent part in politics.

It is interesting to observe that politicians, whether Democrats or Republicans, Conservatives or Liberals, Home Rulers or Tories, are generally very much in favor of having the help and interference of ecclesiastics in political matters, when the ecclesiastic is in their favor. When the ecclesiastics favor "the other man," then we hear the cry of "priests in politics," and are wonderfully enlightened as to all the evils which must arise when men who should keep to their vocation as ministers of religion descend into the political arena.

It may seem a strange assertion, but I believe it is true, that a priest who brought a legal action against his bishop, no matter how just the case might be, could not get a fair trial. One of several reasons would be that Catholics have a strong feeling against any condemnation of ecclesiastical au-

thority, and some would inevitably be judge or jury. It would need a thorough knowledge of the inner working of the Catholic Church to understand this subject fully. The vast majority of Catholics know nothing whatever of the private troubles, sins or wrongs of the Catholic clergy. The present writer heard a priest say, long before the McGlynn case became known, that the greatest scandals were never known, while trifling matters, easily explained and soon forgotten, were alone made public.

It may be said, however, that a good priest can always appeal with certainty of justice to the Holy See. There never was a greater or more mischievous fallacy. The priest who dares to take a case against his bishop to Rome is a marked man. He may gain his case in Rome, but he comes back to break his heart in America.

A little knowledge of human nature will suffice to justify my assertion. Consider the tremendous power of a Catholic bishop over priests and religions. He is an autocrat, he may be a benevolent man but his whole training and position tempts him to be the very reverse. The habitual mode of action of a Catholic bishop in regard to his priests tends to the exercise of chronic tyranny.

It is a mode of government which saves a great deal of trouble. There is no one to obstruct or contradict his action, and human nature is human nature. Even in holy Scripture there is a solemn warning against lording it over God's heritage.

The case of Dr. McGlynn has been compared to the case of a man who joins a club, and who is justly expelled

if he violates the rules of the club, or to the case of a clergyman of any denomination who can be removed from his charge if he teaches doctrines contrary to the confession to which he subscribed; so far the comparison is just. The difference lies in the consequence, and that difference is the sting and misery of the whole case.

If a man is expelled from his club, unless it be for some very great moral crime, he can join another, public opinion will do him justice, and he will not be socially lowered for the rest of his life. If a minister of the Gospel changes his religious opinion he will probably have to suffer a good deal for conscience' sake, but he will certainly not be left without friends.

How different is the case of a Catholic priest who has appealed to Rome even successfully. In the first place he must go to Rome, a long, weary, expensive journey, and with only a faint hope of success. He must remain in Rome, at great expense for months, perhaps for several years. He will be harassed as a necessary part of the routine of business. The Roman courts are slow in these cases, necessarily and wisely—wisely because to revoke a decision would be to place a court which is supposed to be all but infallible in a very unpleasant position. Necessarily, because replies to charges are often met with counter-charges. Time and space conspire against a speedy judgment. The poor priest may suppose that his case is finally settled, only to find some new point raised on which the Propaganda must be further informed, and which involves further correspondence and further delay.

FATHER O'CONNOR'S LETTERS TO CARDINAL GIBBONS.

LETTER II.

NEW YORK, February 16, 1887.

SIR :—The day after my last letter was written you took steamer from this city for Europe, in company with Cardinal Taschereau, of Quebec. Your destination was Rome, to receive from the Pope's hands the red hat that will make you a real "Prince of the Church." Last year when you were designated a Cardinal, you were decorated with the scarlet beretta and skull cap only, though the ceremonies in your Cathedral at Baltimore were as imposing and the display as gorgeous as if you had received the full regalia. The President of the United States was expected to attend, but he only sent a member of his cabinet and the Marine Band to do you honor. If he had attended in person, the "Catholic vote" would be for him to a man at the next election. But shrewd politician that he is, he perceived that the "Catholic vote" alone could not yet elect the President.

When you reached Havre the first week of this month, your arrival was announced by cable and some interesting incidents of the voyage communicated to the American press. Among other things, we were told that a sailor was washed overboard, and that Father Donohue, who accompanied you as chaplain, secretary and valet, "threw a conditional absolution after him." This event was not commented on by the press generally, but its importance ought not to be overlooked.

"Conditional absolution" is something that only a Roman theologian could invent. What is it? We know what "conditional baptism" in your Church means—the sprinkling of water by a priest on a person who has been previously baptized by a Protestant minister. The words used by the priest as he pours the water on the head of the person are—"*si non es baptizatus, ego te baptizo, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*"—"If thou art not baptized, I baptize thee, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." You teach that Baptism is essential to salvation, and that the soul is regenerated the moment the words of the priest are uttered. If this be so, it must be confessed that such "regeneration" does not long abide with the members of your Church.

But though Baptism is accounted essential, I was not aware that the absolution of a priest was absolutely necessary for a soul to enter heaven. When I was a priest of your Church I knew my theology well enough to be able to tell the people that "perfect contrition" rendered the priest's absolution unnecessary. But perfect contrition meant such a great sorrow for sin as few were capable of, so that practically the priestly absolution was necessary. Still it could not be denied that a soul might be saved without such absolution. Several persons whose names are in your calendar as "Saints" lived in the desert where they had no priests to absolve them for many years. Such of them as were in holy orders could absolve themselves, like some of our priests in Chicago who never went to confession. One of them when asked why he did not go, replied that he gave himself

absolution as often as was necessary. Very many priests never go to confession at all, and of those who do, few will tell their stories to priests that know them. There is reason for this. Human nature is very strong in priests, as strong, indeed, as in full-blooded men of the world, and is seldom restrained by grace. It would be embarrassing, to say the least, for some of them to have their brother priests intimately acquainted with all their secret thoughts and actions. Thus it is that if they have not ready access to a member of one of the religious orders, whom they may not meet in clerical society, they will go without confession until the "annual retreat," and will evade even that, if possible.

But the common people have no such resource. They are continually urged by the priests to go to confession, and they are threatened with excommunication if they do not confess their sins at least once a year. Missions by the "holy fathers" are frequently held in the churches for the sole purpose of coercing, and frightening the people by hell-fire, etc., to go to confession. They cannot be saved without it, and yet they will not acknowledge that they are dependent on the priests for forgiveness of their sins. Those of them who desire the respect of their American neighbors will frequently assert that they are free to confess to God alone, and do not place all, their reliance on the priests. This is partly true, though not in the sense they would have it understood. They confess not only to Almighty God, but to the saints and priests. Last year when I was lecturing in the Genesee Valley in this State, an Irish Roman Catholic who heard me in Fowlerville said he confessed his sins to God alone, and, as far as he knew, so did all other Catholics. At the close of my discourse in the Presbyterian church he and I had a public conference on the subject, the audience remaining until a late hour. I had said that as our sins were committed in the sight of God alone, our confession should be made to him. My Roman friend said he always confessed to God alone, though he afterwards told his sins to the priest. I invited him to tell us how he did it—not to repeat his sins before the congregation, but to tell us his mode of proceeding.

"Well," said he, "I examine my conscience before confession, and when I kneel to the priest I say, 'I confess to Almighty God,' and then I tell all my sins to the priest."

"But," I interposed, "don't you confess to any other being than God before you tell your sins to the priest?"

"No," said he, looking me squarely in the face, "I do not."

I asked him to repeat the form—the "confiteor," used by every Roman Catholic before confessing to the priest.

"'I confess to Almighty God'; that's all," said he.

"No, it is not all; you confess to many more persons besides Almighty God." And then I made him repeat the "confiteor" as follows:

"I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary ever Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and to all the saints, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed; through my fault, through my fault, through my exceeding great fault." Here he struck his breast three times, as the rubric requires, and did not proceed any

further, as the audience was convulsed with laughter. By the prescribed words of the form he acknowledged that he did confess to many other persons besides Almighty God and the priest.

After the priest has heard the confession—no one can say whether Michael and John or Peter and Paul heard it, or were busy elsewhere at the time—he requires the penitent to make an act of contrition, then imposes a “penance,” gives some good advice—if he is a conscientious man—and raising his right hand over the head of the penitent, pronounces the absolution in the following words (in Latin):

“May our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee; and I by his authority absolve thee from every bond of excommunication, suspension and interdict, as far as I am able, and as thou art in need.

“I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father †, [he makes the sign of the cross] and of the Son †, [another cross] and of the Holy Ghost Amen.

“May the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of the blessed Virgin Mary, whatever good thou has done and evil resisted be to thee in remission of sins, an increase of grace, and the reward of eternal life. Amen.”

All this form is required on ordinary occasions, but in cases of necessity, as in danger of death, the preamble to the absolution is omitted, and the priest exercises the function of supreme absolver in the following words (in Latin): “I absolve thee from all censures and sins, in the name of the Father †, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.”

Undoubtedly this was the form used by Father Donohue when he cast an absolution after the drowning sailor. But he must have added a prayer in English, “God have mercy upon your poor soul, my man,” if he had any bowels of mercy, for the wind and the waves might have taken the Latin absolution to the other side of the steamer and made it of no effect. And then remembering that the sailor was a Frenchman who did not understand English, Father Donohue, if not a master of that language, doubtless rushed to your confrere, Cardinal Taschereau, and implored him to send a French benediction after the poor soul.

To a rational being the whole proceeding must have appeared very absurd, and to a Christian nothing less than blasphemous; but to the Romanist it was only one more evidence of the great power of the priests to forgive sins. In the ninth chapter of the Gospel of St. Matthew we learn that when our Lord Jesus Christ said to the man sick of the palsy: “Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven thee,” the scribes thought within themselves, “This man blasphemeth.” The thought was a natural one. They did not believe in Christ or know of his power to forgive sins to heal the sick. But he having compassion on their ignorance, restored the sick man to health, and the multitude glorified God, who had given such power unto men. When the priests of your Church who say they are like Christ and equal to Christ—*Sacerdos alter Christus* is the theological phrase, “The priest another Christ”—when you and your priests, Cardinal, can raise the dead to life, I will believe in your power to forgive sins, and will resume that calling myself. Meantime I shall continue to preach that Jesus Christ alone has power on earth to forgive sins, and that the man is a sacrilegious thief who would steal this jewel from his crown.

JAMES A. O'CONNOR.